



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

G. S. SEXTON & Co. v. C. AULTMAN & Co.—Decided at Wytheville, July 25, 1895.—*Buchanan, J* :

1. PLEADING—*Act of limitations—set-off under Sec. 3299 of Code—replication.* The general rule that the statute of limitations must be specially pleaded has no application to a plea of equitable set-off under sec. 3299 of the Code. The only replication which is allowed to such plea, under sec. 3300 of the Code, is a general replication, and under that replication the plea of the statute of limitations may be relied on.

2. PLEADING—*Set-off—plea—notice—act of limitations—replication.* A defendant may make the defense of set-off, other than the equitable set-off under sec. 3299 of the Code, either by a formal plea, or by a *notice* of the set-off accompanied by an account of set-offs. If the defense be by plea, he must reply it specially; but if the defense be by *notice*, there can be no replication and the act of limitations may be relied on without further pleading.

3. INSTRUCTIONS—*Surprise.* A correct instruction upon a point which the evidence tends to prove can never work a surprise in law.

COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD OF ALBEMARLE COUNTY v. A. J. FARRISH'S ADM'R AND OTHERS.—Decided at Staunton, September 30, 1895.—*Harrison, J* :

1. CHANCERY PLEADING—*Multifariousness—convenience—injury to parties.* A bill will not be declared multifarious if it proposes to accomplish the end in view in a manner and by a proceeding convenient to all concerned, unless the course pursued is so injurious to one or more of the parties as to render it inequitable to accomplish the general convenience in that manner,

2. CHANCERY PLEADING—*Multifariousness—case at bar.* A decedent had been county treasurer for several terms, and had given official bonds with sureties for each term for which he was elected. Upon his death, a bill was filed against his administrator and the sureties on his several official bonds as treasurer, for the purpose of administering his estate, settling his several accounts as treasurer, and having decrees against his administrator and the sureties on his several official bonds for the amounts due by them respectively.

Held: The method pursued is convenient and suitable, no injury is thereby done to anyone, and the bill is not multifarious.

CENTRAL LAND COMPANY v. OBENCHAIN.—Decided at Staunton, September 26, 1895.—*Buchanan, J* :

1. NEW TRIAL—*Payment of costs—objection for non-payment.* Where a new trial has been granted upon condition of payment of the costs of the former trial, as prescribed by section 3542 of the Code, but the costs are not paid at or before the next succeeding term of the court, the court may, on the motion of the opposing party, set aside the order granting it and proceed to judgment on the verdict, or it may award execution for costs as may seem best; but if neither is